

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/830,042	HOLT, JOHN M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	J. Derek Rutten	2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) J. Derek Rutten. (3) _____.

(2) Myron Wyche, Reg. No. 47,341. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Supplemental Reply (attached).

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Morshed, Scales.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Wyche submitted a proposed supplemental reply which included an amendment clarifying that the invention was directed to an application written for a single computer. Examiner Rutten reviewed the proposal, but was not convinced that the amendment would place the application in condition for allowance. The proposed amendment appeared to correlate with the description of "clustering" found at the top of page 3 of the specification. In compliance with MPEP 714.03(a)(2)(i), the supplemental reply was not entered since it did not clearly place the application in condition for allowance. Mr. Rutten agreed to continue looking for allowable subject matter and contact Mr. Wyche if such matter was found.